

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/848,896	05/04/2001	Stephen Ernest Jacobson	CH2714 US NA	2714 US NA 8728		
23906	7590 12/03/2003		EXAM	EXAMINER		
E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY			LANGEL, WAYNE A			
	TENT RECORDS CENTER ILL PLAZA 25/1128	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	ASTER PIKE		1754			
WILMINGTON, DE 19805			DATE MAILED: 12/03/2003			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•				· ·
	Application No. 848896	Applicant(s	200504	eta/
Office Action Summary	Examiner -		Group Art Unit	
	Examiner Lang	iel	1754	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	rs on the cover sheet b	eneath the c	correspondence add	iress—
Period for Reply	₹ ¬			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO THIS COMMUNICATION.	ro expire	MONTH((S) FROM THE MAIL	ING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defar Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	reply within the statutory mir ult, expire SIX (6) MONTHS for atute, cause the application t	nimum of thirty om the mailing to become ABA	(30) days will be conside date of this communicat ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 1	ered timely. tion. 33).
Status Q_	11-03			
Status Responsive to communication(s) filed on				<u></u> •
☐ This action is FINAL .				
 Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 193 			to the merits is clo	sed in
Disposition of Claims	-18			
Claim(s) and 3-		$_{-}$ is/are pending in the application.		
Of the above claim(s)	is/are	_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
□ Claim(s)	10	is/are	allowed.	
Claim(s) 2 and 3-1	0	is/are	rejected.	
☐ Claim(s)		is/are	objected to.	
□ Claim(s)		are su requin		election
Application Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on	io approved	•		
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	• •	□ uisapprov	rea.	
	cted to by the Examine			
 □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. 				
·				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)				
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a	⊢(d).		
□ All □ Some* □ None of the:				
☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been	, .	1_		
☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been	- · ·	0	•	
 Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen in this national stage application from the Internation 		(a))		
*Certified copies not received:	·	(a))		_
	,			·
Attachment(s)	//			
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper N	o(s). <u>/ (</u>	iterview Sum	nmary, PTO-413	
Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892	⊔ N	☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152		
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-94	18 · 🗆 C)ther		
Office A	Action Summary			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 11/00)

Part of Paper No.

Serial No. 09/848,896
Art Unit 1754

Claims 1, 3-6, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no "description support" in the original specification for employing a zeolite having a silicon to aluminum ratio "greater than about 15". Applicant's argument, that basis for this limitation is in the specification at page 12, lines 9-13, is not convincing, since that portion of the specification discloses that a mordenite having a silicon to aluminum ratio of 15 was employed. Such disclosure would not provide support for a silicon to aluminum ratio of "greater than about 15".

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amelin et al. (Russian Invention

Serial No. 09/848,896

Art Unit 1754

Specification 226567) (of record) in view of either Sharp (newly cited) or McGill et al. (newly cited). Amelin et al. disclose that sulfur trioxide was produced from gaseous mixtures by adsorbing the sulfur trioxide on a silica gel at 50 to 120°, with subsequent desorption at 150 to 300°, and discloses that the dry solid product is easily transportable. The difference between the process and sorbent disclosed by Amelin et al., and that recited in applicant's claims, is that Amelin et al. do not specifically disclose that the silica should have a pore size of at least 0.5 nanometers. Sharp and McGill et al. both disclose silica having pore sizes of greater than 0.5 nanometers. the Abstract of Sharp and the Abstract of McGill et al.) would be prima facie obvious to employ the silica of either Sharp or McGill et al. as the sorbent in the process of Amelin et al., since the process of Amelin et al. is directed broadly to the use of any known or conventional silica gel, and one of ordinary skill in the art would expect that the silica gels of Sharp and McGill et al. which have high pore diameters would be useful as sulfur trioxide sorbents, since the higher pore diameters would allow the sulfur trioxide to be trapped more easily than would a silica gel with a smaller pore diameter.

Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

Serial No. 09/848,896

Art Unit 1754

regards as the invention. In claim 7, it is indefinite as to what would constitute a "silicalite". In any event, there is no antecedent basis for "silicalite", since claim 1 requires that the sorbent be either silica or a zeolite. It is also indefinite in claim 7 as to whether the recitation of "having a silicon to aluminum ratio of at least 25" would refer to both the silicalite and the zeolite, or only to the zeolite. In claim 9, it is indefinite as to whether the sorbent is required to be a zeolite, or whether the sorbent could be a composition other than a zeolite, so long as the composition has a silicon to aluminum ratio of at least 25.

This application apparently discloses allowable subject matter.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne A. Langel whose telephone number is (703) 308-0248. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8 A.M. to 3:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman, can be reached on (703) 308-3837. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Serial No. 09/848,896

-5-

Art Unit 1754

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2351.

WAL:cdc

November 25, 2003

